HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XIII, No. 24 Saturday, June 16, 1956 Washington, D. C.

News Section

Printed in Two Sections

The New Crisis: The aftermath of the President's operation inspired one bit of wholesome comic relief to the mounting tension — a Capital cartoonist was moved to draw a group of Washington politicos each accoutered with stethoscope and other medical apparata. When self-serving politicos become medical authorities, the hubbub on Ike's physical condition is reduced to absurdity.

Republicans have a strong position when they point out how Ike recovered from last year's heart attack. And that position does not grow weaker as the transparency of the Democratic exploitation of last week's operation becomes more noticeable. However, although GOP members present a logically optimistic case to the world, it is only fair to concede that privately they are none too happy.

For one matter, they recall Ike's proviso when he announced he would run last spring — that he would, if he thought himself physically unable to continue, take himself out of the race.

(However, one of the most important right-wing conservatives in the GOP, never prone to wishful thinking, gave HUMAN EVENTS his personal opinion that Ike will under no circumstances retire this year.)

Nevertheless, many Republicans do worry about that proviso and speculate as to what might happen if physical weakness forced Ike to bow out, say about August 1. In that case, all the delegates to the GOP convention, now pledged to vote for Eisenhower, would be released. The convention would become "open," with tumultuous consequences.

One delegate told us this week: "I am the only really serious political delegate on the delegation from my state. The rest are people who are amateurs and who only consented to serve reluctantly; they weren't much interested. Some simply looked on the job as a chance to visit the scenery of the Pacific Coast. Since our state has a Democratic Governor, no one will control that delegation. There will be many other delegations like mine."

Additionally, it is pointed out, there will be at least a half dozen GOP state governors who would all at once became more than mere favorite sons, and who would create a babel of conflicting claims for themselves. As one Republican put it, "It would be a Donnybrook Fair."

Yet an even more confusing prospect can be imagined. If Ike should have to take himself out later, say in October, the blow to the morale of the party would be considerable. For there would be no time then to build up a new candidate, and a probably divided National Committee would have to try to agree on a man. But (said one member sadly) "That's a possibility which we gambled would not come up, when we set our course last winter."

One thing is obvious and certain (both Democrats and Republicans now agree) in this fluid situation: there is nothing, politically speaking, certain now. The situation is unprecedented and experience from the past is of scant help to leaders who now want to make plans. They say — anything can happen.

But — one happy remark attributed to Jim Farley goes around the town: "This makes two strikes against Ike. But he might still hit a home run."

Of Milton: The resignation of Dr. Milton Eisenhower from his post as head of Penn State College happened on the same day as the President's intestinal operation, but that — it is explained here — was purely coincidental.

Dr. Milton Eisenhower, since his brother became President, has increasingly absented himself from his college office and was known to be frequently in the White House in Washington. These absences have increased sharply since the first of the year when Ike returned to Washington from Colorado. In the Pennsylvania college town, it is known that the authorities of the college became more and more discontented with this situation. (It is also

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1956 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

known that the Democratic state administration of Governor Leader in Harrisburg was by no means sympathetic to this state of affairs in this state-controlled institution.)

Word of this dissatisfaction got to Dr. Milton Eisenhower and finally, about a month ago, he offered his resignation and it was accepted. However, the formal, public and official announcement had to wait for the next meeting of the board which took place just a day before President Eisenhower's new illness. Dr. Milton did not appear at the college commencement ceremony, a final absence which was not appreciated in the college town.

The plans of the President's brother are not known, but here in Washington it is expected that he will play as big, if not a bigger role behind the scenes in the White House than previously.

Democratic Sideshow: When Harriman threw his hat in the ring for the Democratic Presidential nomination last week, he got somewhat involved in his political terminology, it was noticed by press circles in Washington (and maybe elsewhere). Ave reaffirmed his backing for a minimum wage of $1.25; also for complete repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act (something which even the most radical New Dealers have apparently lost hope of attaining); and, of course, he is foursquare for enforcing civil rights on the Southerners. Additionally, Ave paid tribute to what he called the "true principles of Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry Truman." Consequently, many very pardonably got the idea that Ave was a "man of the Left."

Yet, two days later, when he was interviewed on television, the New York Governor startled his auditors by his answer to a reporter's inquiry, "Are you a left-winger, Governor?" Harriman angrily replied, "I am not — I am a conservative." Some political scientists might classify this as simply a case of a candidate trying to ride both horses, one of socialistic demagogy, the other of conservatism. But, here in Washington, it is remarked, Ave's claim to be a conservative is a notable concession to the prevailing conservative wind of the present American political climate.

How To Win An Election: What 25 hard-working enthusiasts can do towards winning an election was demonstrated last week when Congressman Ralph W. Gwinn won renomination in the 27th District of New York by 13,516 to his opponent's 11,501. Gwinn's lead was about 2,000 out of a Republican registration of 78,348.

Often called "Mr. Conservative," Gwinn has been the number one target of the *Daily Worker* and Americans for Democratic Action and New York City's New Deal Republican bloc. More money was sent up from New York City in hopes of defeating him, than perhaps, has ever been spent in any Congressional primary anywhere in the United States. Huge newspaper ads, signs, and photographs of his opponent, on buses, trains and in stores were used on a lavish scale.

A retired New York City police officer named Harold Kiley (vice-president of the United Americans Against Communism, Hotel Martinique, 39 West 32nd St., New York 1, N.Y.) organized an Action Committee before the primary to renominate Gwinn. With Mr. and Mrs. Robert Vogeler as Honorary Chairmen, and 26-year-old Joseph Gannon, the group rented a vacant store in an off-location where 10 telephones were installed and the services of 25 volunteers were obtained. During the last 6 days before election, 10 persons were on the telephone from 1 P.M. until 9 P.M. Fifteen other volunteers looked up telephone numbers. They were able to reach 5,000 of the 78,000 registered Republicans.

The selling talk was simple:

"This is so-and-so calling from Congressman Gwinn's headquarters. We urge you to vote for Ralph Gwinn for Congress next Tuesday. He needs your help."

If the respondent's attitude was negative toward Gwinn, no time was wasted in argument. The objective was solely to get *pro-Gwinn* voters to the polls, not to have amateurs attempt to make conversions over the telephone.

Many respondents said they were pro-Gwinn but did not expect to vote in the primaries. The automatic answer was, "You must vote next Tuesday or there won't be any November for Gwinn. This will be a close race. Gwinn needs your help."

Mr. Kiley is a firm believer in "the magic two per cent." In most election districts, two per cent will turn the tide. In the 27th New York District, about 2½ per cent (2,000) of the 78,000 registered voters actually did turn the tide. This margin, it is believed, was obtained by 5,000 telephone calls from 25 volunteers. A lesson in political effectiveness!

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Judicial Left Field: Probably more forcefully than any previous occasion, this week's opinion session of the Supreme Court, which wound up its work for the 1955-56 term, demonstrated conclusively the philosophical affinity of the Republican-appointed Chief Justice, Earl Warren, for the Court's two furthest-left Justices, Hugo L. Black and William O. Douglas.

Of fifteen matters decided during the session by formal opinion, the Warren-Black-Douglas team voted as a unit on fourteen; in one minor case, Douglas deserted the team to join Justices Frankfurter and Harlan in a 6-3 dissent. Only three cases were unanimous. The others involved various divisions, in some of which the team found enough support from other Justices to become the majority; in some of which they dissented.

In the alien deportation case, Warren, Black, Douglas and Frankfurter each wrote separate dissents assailing the majority ruling on various points, but all arguing that any alien facing deportation proceedings should be allowed to confront any accusers. This "confrontation" requirement, of course, is one of the basic demands of the anti-anti-Communist liberal-left, *a la* the Fund for the Republic.

Warren's leftist proclivities become particularly noteworthy in view of President Eisenhower's operation and renewed rumblings from "liberal" Republicans laying the groundwork for a "draft-Warren" movement in the unlikely event Mr. Eisenhower should take himself out of the race.

Superimposing Warren's three-year record as Chief Justice on top of his 10-year record as Governor of California, Washington pundits foresee the likelihood that if such a draft operation ever should succeed, history of recent decades probably would be reversed, with the GOP nominee running as the "socialist liberal" and the Democratic nominee, even Adlai Stevenson, perhaps being the more conservative of the two major candidates.

Leftward Court (Cont'd): Having invalidated state sedition laws and New York City's automatic discharge of any City employee invoking the Fifth Amendment during the past two months, the leftward-inclining Supreme Court this week circumscribes the Federal personnel security program to exclude all non-sensitive positions.

The tribunal's majority in this 6-3 split follows the same tack as did the Court in the Nelson decision upsetting 42 state sedition laws, in interpreting a Federal law to suit its own ideas. In the Nelson case, it said, Congress in enacting various subversive control measures, obviously intended to pre-empt the field for exclusive Federal control so state laws must fall. With the original sponsors of these laws disclaiming ever having had any such intentions, the reaction of Congress is a determination to enact legislation to restore the state laws to full force and effect. (One such measure, HR 3, which covers all laws including sedition laws, was reported out favorably this week by the Senate Judiciary Committee.)

In this week's security program ruling, the Court says Congress intended the 1950 Security Program Act to cover only holders of jobs "concerned with the national safety," and that President Eisenhower violated the law by extending it to apply to all Federal jobs.

LETTERS FROM COLLEGE STUDENTS

HARRY H. LACEY — *Princeton University:* "I am a political conservative, but many of my friends who are not, also read my copy of HUMAN EVENTS. They believe that your publication is very interesting as it presents many ideas to them that they have not run across before."

JOHN K. WILLIAMS — *Wisconsin University:* "Please continue my subscription for another year through I.S.I. I enjoy your newsletter very much and find it very helpful in beating down the so-called "liberals" on the Wisconsin campus."

WILLIAM M. SCHULTZ — *Montclair High School:* "I consider HUMAN EVENTS so important that every week after digesting every news note, I carefully file it in a personal file that contains only the most important articles about economics and politics. Next year I am going to college, either to Antioch or the Northwestern School of Journalism and I hope that you can continue to send me your fine newsletter."

ROMAN W. LAPINSKI — *Grand Rapids Junior College:* "HUMAN EVENTS is a good antidote to take after reading the college textbooks on Sociology and Economics. I hope that it will be possible for me to receive HUMAN EVENTS through the summer and on into the next school year as I keep a continuous file and use it frequently in my studies."

PAUL F. CROCKETT — *Asbury Seminary:* "I have appreciated reading your unbiased reports and find them to be a very informative and interesting addition to my library."

TIM HAY—*Harvard Business School:* "HUMAN EVENTS is often helpful to me in countering propaganda from the local collectivists. I can't afford a subscription now but I would certainly appreciate it if you would continue my subscription at the same college address next year."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Justice Tom Clark's dissent, with Justices Reed and Minton concurring, says the history of the legislation shows clearly it was intended by Congress to cover all Federal employees if the President deemed it advisable. It adds that, "We believe the Court's order has stricken down the most effective weapon against subversive activity available to the Government."

(To Washington observers whose memories go back to the 30's when Sherman Minton was a New Deal Senator from Indiana, it seems strange that he should become one of the Supreme Court's conservatives; but legal students say that is exactly his present status.)

Majority reaction at the Capitol is typified by the announcement of Senator James Eastland, Chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee and its Internal Security Subcommittee, that he will sponsor legislation to overturn the Court's decision and legalize Government-wide application of the program.

But to uphold its reputation for unpredictability, referred to in last week's HUMAN EVENTS "Leftward Court" news article, the Court this week turned around to hold, 5-4, that the Government can use "confidential information" to deport an alien whose record may be clear otherwise.

Farm Land Racket: The Indianapolis *Times* has uncovered a $20 million racket in the leasing of U.S. farm lands. The *Times* found that the U.S. Government was leasing farm land that it owns in Indiana for $9 or $10 an acre — some land for as little as $1 an acre. Because it was U.S.-owned land, the leases did not provide for "quotas" such as limit other farmers. The leased lands often consisted of good soil that yielded exceptionally good crops. As a result, the Federal Government was in effect buying back the crops for as much as $105 an acre. In one instance, the Government rented back from its own tenant a little corner of its own land to store the "surplus" created by the lease (while it rotted away) and the Government paid in rental for that little corner of its own land more than it got in rental for the entire piece.

The *Times* reporter found that the U.S.-owned leased acreage amounts to 12,500 acres in Indiana and about 2 million acres in the whole country. The "take" from the lease-and-buy-back-deal is estimated as $2 million for Indiana alone and $20 million for the entire country.

Senator Capehart and Representative Ralph Harvey of Indiana have prepared legislation to make the plan illegal. However, conservative members of Congress comment privately that the rackets created by our 70 billion dollar Big Government spring up faster than they can be detected.

Education: Critics who contend that "progressive education," as advocated by the National Education Association and other liberal groups, is failing to teach the nation's youth as well as did methods of the past, receive support from an unexpected quarter.

A survey conducted during the past year by the Educational Testing Service of Princeton, N. J., under the sponsorship of the Carnegie Corporation, results in the conclusion that the teaching of mathematics is in a wretched state. The finding merely confirms reports from many HUMAN EVENTS correspondents who have told, on the basis of personal experience with their own school-age children, of poor and inept teaching of mathematics in their own localities.

The survey covered 60 individual classrooms in five states, 36 rooms in elementary schools and 24 in secondary. It found that on both levels, mathematics was one of the poorest taught subjects.

Of the 60 teachers involved, only 10 were reported as competent; the other 50 were said to be unable to teach their subject, many of them were barely able to keep ahead of their pupils. The report also was highly critical of mathematics curricula.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 6 weeks for $1.

Yearly rate, $10; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.

By first class mail, $12 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $14 a year. FOREIGN: by regular mail, $13 a year; airmail, $18.

Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.

1955 Bound Annual Volume with complete Index $15. All Bound Volumes for years prior to 1955 have been sold.

The Declaration of Independence opens: "When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . ."

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher* JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*

Contributing Editors: FRANK CHODOROV, WILLIS J. BALLINGER

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Entered as second class matter at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1956.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Volume XIII, No. 24 **HUMAN EVENTS** June 16, 1956

The Administration is urging the appropriation of $4.9 billion for foreign aid. HUMAN EVENTS thinks $1.4 billion would be sufficient, that to be used for Formosa, South Korea and a few other places where the United States has special obligations.

A cut of $3.5 billion in foreign aid would make possible a 10 per cent cut in the personal income taxes of EVERY individual U.S. taxpayer. (Estimated revenue in fiscal 1957 from personal income taxes, $35 billion.)

If you want to work for such a reduction, send this brilliant analysis by Spruille Braden, former Ambassador and Assistant Secretary of State, to your friends and associates; ask them to write your Senator and Representative requesting a cut in foreign aid and in taxes. Set a good example by doing it yourself, too — enclosing this Braden article.

Article Section

RESPECT AND FOREIGN AID

By HON. SPRUILLE BRADEN*

Former Ambassador and Assistant Secretary of State

● **A distinguished** and experienced diplomat who preceded me by some years in one of my ambassadorial posts, used to say: "It is all to the good if the American Ambassador is liked; but it is much more important that he be respected."

I agree with him completely.

While respect, according to the circumstances may sometimes have a connotation of fear, it far oftener evidences friendship. Also, as respect engenders friendship, so its absence will, in the end, destroy both confidence and friendship.

Before going any further, I should make my meaning clear by quoting Noah Webster's definition of respect:

"to consider worthy of esteem, to regard or treat with honor, deference or the like; value . . .; to refrain from intruding upon or interfering with, as to respect a person's privacy."

So we see that respect may range from the less important amenities or courtesies with which we salute and treat with honor a person of high rank, to that much more important aspect of respect which is the esteem or value which is due character, virtue and natural greatness.

I do not underrate the importance of a proper deference. For instance, as an individual, I do not care whether I am seated above or below the salt. But, when I served as Ambassador, I represented the United States and, therefore, demanded that I be seated according to protocol.

Of one thing we may be sure: respect never can be bought. The mere attempt to do so can only breed disdain and irritation. Yet, that is precisely what we have been trying to do for many years.

Against the 275 to 280 billion dollar direct Federal debt, excluding many more billions of contingent or governmentally guaranteed indebtedness, it has been estimated that since 1939 the United States has given away abroad about $100 billion. Despite the extravagance and waste involved, some of this vast sum must be charged off as a war necessity and so, for the purpose of this discussion may be eliminated.

Nevertheless, it is important to call your attention to the fact that this country has a greater debt than the combined debts of all of the other nations in the world.

What mainly concerns me today is that since 1946, after the end of World War II, we have given away upwards of $41 billion in outright grants to foreign nations, and disbursed almost $14 billion in credits. Their eventual repayment is, to say the least, questionable. The total of our handouts abroad is $55.5 billion. By this lavish generosity, we have gained neither respect nor friends. On the contrary, I believe it is apparent to anyone that we have lost both.

In order to approach this matter intelligently, we must first be able to comprehend what is $55 billion. It does not help my own understanding to talk about a billion fenceposts spaced one foot apart, girdling the earth X times. Nor is my conception clarified by the calculation that if I were to receive one dollar for each minute that has elapsed since Christ was born, I would have slightly over $1 billion.

I do grasp the value of $55 billion, when I add the assessed valuation (as reported by Moody's Municipal and Government Manual of 1956) of all of the property, real and otherwise, in the 13 biggest cities of this country: New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Los Angeles, Detroit, Baltimore, Cleveland, St. Louis, Washington, San Francisco, Boston, Houston and Pittsburgh, and arrive at a grand total of just over $55 billion.

The New York State Board of Equalization and Assessment recently declared that the assessed valuation of all real and other property in New York City equals just about 100% of the true value. Presumably, on the overall average, this will apply to the other 12 cities.

We would be appalled by the mere suggestion that these 13 cities, if it were possible, be shipped overseas as gifts to foreign nations. Yet, we have done precisely that. We have ourselves given away — in effect, destroyed, as if by nuclear bombing — the equivalent of our 13 biggest cities!

*A speech by Ambassador Braden before New England Export Club, Inc., Boston, Mass.

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1956 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The dollar loss and the consequent drain on us taxpayers, at that, may not be so serious as the harm done to the morals and morale of both the recipient countries and ourselves, as donors.

Certainly over $55 billion in gifts and other handouts should bring spectacular and superlative results in the way of augmented respect and friendship. Yet, it is already evident that it has not and that no people ever gave so much for so little.

● **Nehru,** despite the hundreds of millions of dollars poured into India, delights in castigating the United States, and he put out the Red Carpet for Bulganin and Khrushchev.

Little Cambodia is getting $50 million a year, not to mention a further gift of 20,000 tons of rice. But the Premier, as he flirts with Communist China, complains that all we give him are refrigerators and automobiles, and that Washington is plotting to buy his country.

Neither the Arabs nor the Israelis seem to like us.

The Turks and Greeks, thrown into inflation by our largesse, are becoming critical of us. In Greece, the Popular Front opposition recently polled more votes than the government candidates supported by us.

Prime Minister Mollet of France declared in the *U. S. News & World Report* that: ". . . the Americans managed to create something very near to hatred . . . by the way they gave their aid." Of course, like other recipients and some of our own do-gooders, he would like to see our bounty distributed anonymously through the UN, with no strings attached. This would eliminate the last remote chance of our ever receiving any thanks, respect or friendship for our generosity.

Iceland's Parliament, under Communist influence, voted that the U.S.A. should pull out its troops and abandon our NATO bases there. Recent elections indicate that Ceylon is going in the same direction.

In Mexico, during January, some technical assistance and educational programs had to be cancelled, because a series of student disturbances made it inadvisable for our technicians to continue.

The rest of Latin America, observing the deluge of billions flooding the rest of the globe, feel hurt because, as our nearest neighbors and allies, we neglect them with a mere pittance.

Thus do we destroy respect and friendship.

A single American company has raised living rates higher and created more general well-being throughout Central America than ever could be done by our governmental aid. Yet, the Department of Justice now blocks the continuance of this work by an anti-trust suit, demanding divestiture, among other things, of the rich farm lands converted by this company from worse than worthless jungle swamps. In announcing this unfair and ignorant action, the Attorney General implicitly endorsed the false accusations leveled against the U.S.A. by the Communists recently ejected from Guatemala. Instead of the increased prosperity and employment which would have resulted from the company's program, this suit will cause hundreds, if not thousands of these people to be partially and ineffectively supported by more U.S. foreign aid, i.e. by your and my taxes.

Almost anywhere we look, our foreign aid programs have been extravagant, wasteful and inefficient. Permit me to give an example: We induced Afghanistan to accept a $40 million loan from the Export-Import Bank, and to spend a very considerable sum themselves, to put in a hydro-electric power, flood control and irrigation project for about 500,000 acres. In Afghanistan there were neither engineers to operate the project, nor agricultural experts to teach the nomads how to farm. The salt content of the lands was raised by the water from the dam to the point of ruination. The result is an economic and political crisis; and the Afghans, having lost respect for us, are turning their eyes towards their big neighbor to the north, the USSR.

Now, evidently just to keep our hand in, we propose through the International Bank, to help finance the huge $1.3 billion Aswam High Dam project in Egypt. Otherwise, Prime Minister Nasser indicates he may become even clubbier with the Soviet than he already is. The USSR prattles vaguely about doing the job and we beg Nasser, "Oh! Pretty please, don't listen to their wiles, take a couple of hundred million of our dollars." What possible respect can we gain by yielding to such blackmail?

The "bleeding hearts" cry that, unless we finance dams and other public works like these, far-off peoples will continue to live in misery. At present, that is as sad as it is true. But let me tell you what may happen even as the result of a well-planned and carried out project, purporting to improve living conditions. Incidentally, this was not one of our government's programs. In, I believe, the 1920's, the Sukkar barrage in Pakistan was erected to irrigate a vast area of fertile but desert land in the Province of Sind, Pakistan, with water from the Indus River. This was to make possible the feeding of a people living on the verge of starvation. What happened? The project did everything claimed for it. But, after a few years, the population so increased that the only effect was to have a much larger number of people on the verge of starvation, instead of a small number. Does this constitute progress? Does this elicit respect?

The answer is "NO!"

I suggest that the authorities in Washington have no right to continue these "give-away" programs, when there is no assurance that even the well-planned and executed ones will not increase rather than decrease human misery.

Another aspect of this program is that we gain neither Tito's nor anyone else's respect by giving his regime hundreds of millions of dollars. We entrench Communism in Yugoslavia, thus antagonizing many of its people, and give the Soviet a greatly strengthened ally, now that Tito is again back, hand in glove with the Kremlin.

Our grants and loans inevitably constitute an intervention by us on behalf of the government in power and against the "outs" in a foreign country.

This is not the best way to make friends of the latter. But our prestige suffers much more when we distribute our largesse to dictators and corrupt governments. Then we lose the respect of, and antagonize all the decent elements in the recipient countries.

From first-hand knowledge, I can assure you that the cordial policy with Peron by both Democratic and Republican Administrations, plus credits respectively of $125 and $60 million, did the United States grievous harm. Peron and his gangsters always have and always will hate us and it will take much time and effort to win back the confidence, respect and friendship of the honest patriotic Argentines.

It has been alleged that in addition to the billions of dollars we have squandered so far, we must now enlarge and make permanent these so-called "foreign aid" programs; that we must "sustain our position by helping *everybody else* to realize their own aspirations and legitimate ambitions . . ." It is said we must do so as a defense against the Soviet and the spread of Communism. It is proclaimed that poverty and illiteracy breed Communism and open the way to Kremlin domination;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

whereas industrialization and higher living standards defeat both of these evils.

These theories simply are not true. In southern Italy, where the greatest poverty and illiteracy exists, there is the least Communism. In the industrialized north, with higher living standards, Communism flourishes. This same condition prevails in many other countries and places.

Poverty and illiteracy can only be eliminated slowly and with the utmost care. It is not a job that can be done overnight. We would destroy, rather than sustain, our position by helping *everybody else* to realize their own aspirations and legitimate ambitions. We have neither the money nor the manpower even to attempt such a colossal adventure. Finally, there is no moral or other obligation on us to give even modest foreign aid, except in a sensible and effective manner, which will benefit everyone concerned and do harm to no one.

● **The Administration** requests more "flexibility" in foreign aid, to make easier "fast adjustments" in who gets how much from the U.S.A. to counter Soviet rivalry; i.e., again we are to dance to Moscow's tune.

Our future projects are to "stir the imagination," to concentrate on the spectacular, rather than on such wise and safe measures as developing sound private World Trade and investment.

The result will be that the genuinely democratic and friendly governments, enjoying healthy economies, will receive little or nothing — as in the case of some of our Latin American neighbors. Whereas, neutralist or inimical governments, often using blackmail techniques, will get paid off with "flexible" benefits.

If I seem bold in my prophesies, it is because on Oct. 6, 1949, when testifying before the House Foreign Affairs Committee against the Point IV legislation, I made a number of pessimistic predictions. They have all come true.

My only error was that I did not go far enough. Among other things, I pointed out that economic development would not "always insure or automatically bring democracy"; that the recipients of governmental largesse would acquire "a distaste for private capital"; and the foreign aid program would eventually "involve us in the worst form of dollar diplomacy." I said, ". . . unless Congress rigidly circumscribes governmental operations under Point IV, there is grave danger that the appropriations . . . within a surprisingly short time, will become enormous."

Since the distribution of $55 billion failed so utterly to produce really worthwhile benefits, why must we continue, like a drug addict, to use more of the same hashish in ever greater quantities?

The simplest answer is that an enormous bureaucracy has been set up in Washington to plan for and run foreign aid. Bureaucratic growth is an intangible but living thing. No one seems to be responsible for its malignant expansion. Yet it always acts the same, as it grows and grows like a cancer. Also, like a cancer, it is almost impossible to rid the body politic of it — and, in the end, it can kill Constitutional representative government.

Through oversized and centralized government, the Washington bureaucrats are able to allot billions of dollars of contracts, which bring handsome profits to a myriad of industries, commercial and shipping firms, and to labor. Thus, possible critics are lured into compliance and State interventionism is spread.

An even stronger influence favoring the give-away programs is the horde of misguided idealists or do-gooders, collectivists or socialists, and the unidentifiable THEYS (see my March 25, 1954 testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security), with a sprinkling of Communists, who staff the lower, medium and even some of the higher echelons in Washington. Nearly all of them — a few, perhaps, unwittingly — are dedicated to the destruction of individual endeavor and of what we proudly call our "way of life."

Let us not be misled in judging their aims by the basic errors of current so-called "liberal" political opinion, as disclosed in the April 2 lead editorial of the *New York Times*. It said:

"To argue that Socialists and Communists are all the same can only help the Communists, who today, for their own purposes, say the same thing — though they too know better.

"This seems to be a false, confusing argument. For no truly informed person claims that 'Socialists and Communists are all the same,' just as no such person claims 'All Democrats and Republicans are the same.'"

The *Times* is right when it says they are not identical, but wrong when it implies that the end results of both ideologies are not the same.

Informed students of Marxism very definitely do claim that:

(1) Socialists and Communists have the same economic aim: to destroy capitalism.

(2) Socialists and Communists alike give their highest loyalty to the basic tenets established by their Internationals. Both subordinate loyalty to the national self-interest of any sovereign state to their loyalty to their ideologies and to the dictums of their Internationalists. Socialists as well as Communists push for the adoption of policies, especially economic ones, which are utterly counter to American principles and practices.

(3) Because the destruction of capitalism inevitably entails violation of the hallowed right to own private property, human nature instinctively rises up to resist Socialism. This resistance, if left free to operate, eventually will create such firm and concerted opposition as to destroy Socialist aims. To achieve these aims, all Socialists, of every variety, in the end, must resort to oppressive measures. When the more timid Socialists shrink at using force, the Communists exert it. Thus, the Socialists pave the way for Totalitarianism, which usually comes in the form of Communism. Especially do they do so during those times when the Socialists and Communists work together in a "Popular Front" directed toward the smashing of capitalism.

● **What respect** can anyone have for us, if we throw away our precious heritage of free private enterprise to create a Frankenstein's Monster of International Socialism which, to survive and succeed, must demolish this Republic?

Neither Socialism nor Communism have to be directed from Moscow, in order to be thoroughly dangerous to us.

Even more ridiculous than our financing of International, or even local, Socialism is that by showering the so-called underdeveloped countries — who already are mostly socialistic — with $55 billion, we have financed the carrying out of an old and fundamental Communist policy.

Lenin wrote: "The more backward the country . . . the more difficult it is for her to pass from the old capitalist relations to socialist relations."

Stalin, in "The Road to Revolution in the West Lies Through the East," explained that if Communism were to succeed in conquering the world, the West-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ern nations' rear guard, i.e., their reserves in the dependent and colonial areas, must be revolutionized. He said:

"That is why it is essential that the proletariat of the advanced countries should render real and prolonged aid to the backward nationalities in their cultural and economic development.

"Unless such aid is forthcoming, it will be impossible to bring the various nations and peoples within a single world economic system that is so essential for the final triumph of socialism."

Since 1941, through ignorance of Communist policy and of this basic Soviet Plan, and by failure to exert effective counteraction, our government, by means of its own, and latterly through United Nations foreign aid, has been and still is subsidizing the USSR's long-range campaign against the U.S.A.

Some of us U.S. taxpayers are getting well fed up with having billions upon billions of our resources and earnings seized by politicians to distribute all over the earth for purposes we are neither consulted about nor permitted to have any control over.

The Soviet, aware of this development, probably fears that we may discontinue underwriting their main program. They are not prepared to take over any such huge charitable undertaking as we have been carrying on. Instead, they chatter about what they are going to do in the way of "foreign aid" themselves. The only concrete offers they have made so far are like those to sell steel mills to India and Pakistan (the latter has neither iron ore nor coking coal) on a cash on the barrel-head basis.

This USSR maneuver has had the desired "come-on" effect. We immediately, and somewhat hysterically, have declared, in the words of a popular song, that when it comes to prodigality, "Anything you can do, we can do better." Nasser and other neutralists already are playing our solid offers against the illusory promises offered by the Kremlin.

* * *

As I have said, the UN and a number of governments and other entities urge that the charge of Americans intruding or interfering, intervening or just plain meddling in other peoples' affairs could be obviated by turning over American funds to the UN to be disbursed by it with complete anonymity for us.

It is alarming that we have gone along with this idea in a number of the UN agencies or affiliates, which handle foreign aid of one kind or another. The last of these was the International Finance Corporation, organized to enter the equity financing field by purchasing convertible debentures. By what right do the politicians take your and my taxes to enter into this speculative realm, which should be restricted to private capital?

Worse still is our UN Delegation's willingness even to consider SUNFED (Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development). This so-called "infra structure" fund is designed, through grants and short or long term interest-free loans, to finance any project which lacks merit enough to attract private capital or to meet the standards of existing lending institutions.

Obviously, no private capital could compete against SUNFED. Pursuant to a sort of Gresham's Law, SUNFED's grants and loans soon would drive all honest and sound credit out of the market. SUNFED is iniquitous.

Now that I have set forth some of the reasons why I believe our foreign aid programs nullify respect for the United States, I shall point to a few remedial measures.

Mankind's experience through the ages may be summarized in some homely sayings, such as:

(1) "Frugality embraces all the other virtues" or "Economy is a great revenue";

(2) "To be supported by the charity of friends or a government dole is to go into the almshouse"; and "Charity begins at home"; or, "He who gets something for nothing, values it at precisely nothing."

(3) "A good example is the best sermon" and "Example is the school of mankind and they will learn at no other."

(4) "Nothing succeeds like success" or "Everyone likes to back a winner."

● **Heaven knows** there is no virtue in bankrupting ourselves as we pour huge revenues into supporting other nations, even allowing them to reduce their own taxes at our expense. They will value this "charity of friends" at precisely nothing. Worse still, it will break their will to earn their own way and undermine their dignity. In the end, our government's dole to them will put them in the almshouse along with us.

* * *

By hard work and thrift, integrity and intelligence under the free, private, competitive enterprise system, the United States grew from a small, poor republic to its present power and economic potential. As a result, our private capital, during the last century, and especially from 1900 on, has gone abroad, bringing with it managerial and technical resources and skills. It has brought to underdeveloped areas all over the earth enormous advantages and such a development as no bureaucrats or governmental agencies ever have or ever could approach.

By returning to this provenly successful system, we will furnish mankind with such a school that they "will learn at no other."

To do these things, we must insist that the prime duty of our government is to protect and advance the legitimate interests of the United States and its citizens; to make certain that our every policy and action be ethical; and unswervingly to stand for the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

Our government must not declare that peace is our sole objective. Instead, it must first demand respect and dignity, honesty and honor, patriotism and freedom.

● **We must eschew** all collectivist panaceas and stop trying to buy friendship. We must balance our budget, reduce taxes to an incentive level and otherwise put our own house in order.

If we will do these things, once again we will become so strong spiritually, economically and every other wise, that other nations, wishing to back a winner and be on our team, will follow our example and make themselves strong. That is the only way to acquire responsible and reliable allies. That is the only way to make ourselves impregnable and to insure Peace. Above all, that is the only way to recapture the Respect of the World.

Additional copies of this 4-page Article: single copies 20¢ (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $20 per thousand.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D.C., and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $10 per year.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS for new subscribers only: 6 weeks for $1.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED